



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT BOSTON, MASS.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD EDITOR.

HISTORY OF THE MOVEMENT FOR AN ARBITRATION TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES.

Everything looks so auspicious for the early establishment of a permanent treaty of arbitration between this country and Great Britain, that a brief rehearsal of the chief events in the history of the movement for such a treaty will certainly interest our readers. No more important movement has ever been inaugurated, and yet comparatively few people seem to know anything about its progress.

Though the first decisive practical step in this direction was taken only six years ago, yet the movement goes back much beyond that time in its preparations at least. Various resolutions, proposed by the friends of peace, approving of the principle of arbitration, had been, previous to 1887, introduced both into the British Parliament and into our own Congress, but with the exception of the resolution of Henry Richard which passed the House of Commons on the eighth of July, 1873, little attention had apparently been given to them, though they served their educative purpose both among legislators and others. The practical results of arbitration between the two countries have also done much to bring about the present disposition to enter into permanent treaty obligations. No less than ten important difficulties between them have been settled by arbitration since the close of the war of 1812.

Coming to the later and more conspicuous events, in 1887 a deputation of thirteen Englishmen, all prominent in public life, brought to this country a memorial signed by two hundred and thirty-three members of the House of Commons. This memorial was presented to President Cleveland on the thirty-first of October, that year. The deputation was introduced to the President by Mr. Andrew Carnegie and the memorial presented by William Randal Cremer, M. P., who had been chiefly instrumental in having it signed by members of Parliament. The memorial was as follows:

"To the President and Congress of the United States of America:

"The undersigned members of the British Parliament learn with the utmost satisfaction that various proposals have been introduced into Congress urging the Government of the United States to take the necessary steps for concluding with the Government of Great Britain a treaty which shall stipulate that any differences or disputes arising between the two Governments which can not be adjusted by diplomatic agency shall be referred to arbitration. Should such a proposal happily emanate

from the Congress of the United States, our best influence shall be used to ensure its acceptance by the Government of Great Britain. The conclusion of such a treaty would be a splendid example to those nations who are wasting their resources in war-provoking institutions and might induce other Governments to join the peaceful compact."

President Cleveland made a very kind response promising to give the matter his "faithful and careful consideration," and expressing his belief that the American people "desire to see the killing of men for the accomplishment of national ambition abolished."

As a sequel to this visit of the English deputation, a resolution known as the "Sherman Concurrent Resolution," was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives on the 4th of April, 1890, having been adopted on the 14th of February by the Senate. This resolution, however, was in perfectly general terms, and was not a direct reply to the request of the members of the British Parliament. It is as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) that the President be, and is hereby requested to invite from time to time, as fit occasion may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration."

The International American Conference which closed its labors in Washington on the 19th of April had drawn up a form of arbitration treaty for the American nations, which was to last for twenty years from the time of ratification. Article XIX of this treaty (which unfortunately lapsed because the American nations failed to ratify it in time) among other things provided that "any other nation may accept this treaty and become a party thereto, by signing a copy thereof and depositing the same with the Government of the United States, etc." This form of treaty was sent in October of that year by the State Department to other governments accompanied by a circular letter. In the letter addressed to Lord Salisbury, then Prime Minister of England, the hope was expressed "that the important objects now sought to be attained may favorably impress this (form of treaty) upon Her Majesty's Government." The United States Government was informed shortly afterwards that the proposal would receive the careful consideration of the Government of Great Britain.

Nothing further was done, however, till the 16th of June this year, a day sure to be most memorable in the history of this movement. On that day the following resolution, introduced by Mr. Cremer and supported by petitions representing more than two millions of petitioners, amended by Mr. Gladstone, passed the House of Commons, *without a division*:

"That this House has learned with satisfaction that both Houses of the United States Congress have authorized the President to invite from time to time, as fit occa-

sions may arise, negotiations with any Government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agencies may be referred to arbitration and peaceably adjusted by such means;

"And that this House, cordially sympathizing with the purpose in view, expresses the hope that Her Majesty's Government will lend their ready coöperation to the Government of the United States upon the basis of the foregoing resolution."

Mr. Bayard, United States Ambassador to Great Britain, in communicating this action of the House of Commons to the State Department at Washington, said that the debate on Mr. Cremer's motion, at which he was present, "was entirely above the usual range of Parliamentary expressions." The Earl of Rosebery, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, sent the following official communication, in July last, to Sir Julian Pauncefote, British Ambassador at Washington:

"Sir—I transmit to your Excellency copy of a resolution which was passed in the House of Commons on the 16th ult., expressing sympathy with the action taken by the Congress of the United States in favor of the settlement of international disputes by arbitration.

"Her Majesty's Government have pleasure in bringing this resolution to the knowledge of the Government of the United States, and would be glad if the President should see fit to lay it before both Houses of Congress.

"I request that your Excellency will communicate a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State with an intimation to the above effect.

"I am, etc.,

ROSEBERY."

Here the matter rests for the present. The way is now more than open for our Government to begin negotiations with the specific aim of securing the establishment of a permanent arbitral treaty between the two countries. Following the history of this great movement, it is seen that England has kept pace with, if not actually outstripped, us in peaceful approaches. Our Government ought certainly to take and certainly will take during the present winter the next—and possibly the final—step in rendering war hereafter impossible between the two great English speaking nations—"two nations but one people," as John Bright was fond of calling them. We hope that President Cleveland may give prominence to the subject in his forth-coming message to Congress. No subject is more worthy of mention and of strong recommendation.

THE AMENDMENT OF THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT.

On the 4th of October Mr. McCreary from the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported to the House of Representatives a bill to amend the Geary act of May 5, 1892. The chief feature of the McCreary amendment is the extension of the time in which Chinamen now in this country may appear before the collectors of inter-

nal revenue and register and receive a certificate of residence. The bill was passed by the House on the 16th of October; but Mr. Geary, whose notoriety has steadily grown in the land, succeeded in getting it so amended that it is nearly as objectionable as the original act. The extension of time is, of course, a good thing, and many Congressmen, we understand, voted for the bill to save the extension clause.

The amendments introduced by Mr. Geary and finally incorporated in the bill provided (1) for a definition of the word "merchant" much narrower than its ordinary meaning; (2) for the furnishing of a photograph as a means of identification; (3) for the appointment of the marshal as the officer entrusted with the duty of deportation. Ten members of the House voted against these amendments, more particularly on account of the photograph clause, which was a part of Mr. Geary's original bill. The amended McCreary bill met with some strong opposition in the Senate, but passed without much study, as that body had worn itself out over the silver question.

While the extension of time provided for in this bill is a good thing, yet it by no means satisfies the enlightened conscience of the country, which has expressed itself strongly and with singular unanimity since the subject first came before Congress in this late and dishonorable form. The whole matter needs overhauling from the bottom up, and Congress ought not to let this winter pass without meeting the just and urgent demands of the country on the subject. There ought to be no restriction law touching immigration or residence which does not apply equally to all nations. There ought to be no restriction law of any kind which violates solemn treaty obligations which have not been abrogated by the mutual consent of the nations concerned. And more fundamental still, there ought to be no restriction law that will prevent any upright and honest individual of any land, to whatever class he may belong, from coming freely to this country for purposes of travel, temporary residence or final citizenship. We claim these rights for ourselves in every part of the globe, and it is in the last degree dishonorable in us to deny them to others of any race.

The Anti-Mongolianism of the California coast has been borne with long enough, and it is high time that Senators and Representatives of the other States, who see clearly, many of them, and feel deeply the dishonor that this "politics" legislation has brought us into should unite in expunging it from the statute book. Hon. William Everett, of Massachusetts, said in a speech on this subject in the House on October 14th: "There is something higher than legal enactments; there is something higher than a decision of the Supreme Court; there is something higher than treaties; there is something higher than the opinion of the Pacific Slope; something higher than the opinion of Massachusetts or the opinions of the United States and the opinions of the whole world;